



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 14, 2004

Mr. Miles K. Risley
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Victoria
P.O. Box 1758
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2004-3975

Dear Mr. Risley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 201568.

The City of Victoria (the "city") received a request for a specified incident report involving a named individual. You state that some of the responsive information will be released to the requestor. You claim, however, that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This exception encompasses information that another statute makes confidential. We initially note that some of the submitted information constitutes medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in

Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have further found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or "[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician." Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990).

Medical records must be released upon the governmental body's receipt of the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that portions of this information, which we have marked, are subject to the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold this information pursuant to the MPA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI "means information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, information, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions" but does not include "driving record information maintained by [the Department of Public Safety ("DPS")] under Subchapter C, Chapter 521, Transportation Code." Gov't Code § 411.082(2).

Federal regulations prohibit the release of CHRI maintained in state and local CHRI systems to the general public. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) ("Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given."), (2) ("No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself."). Under chapter 411 of the Government Code, a criminal justice agency may obtain CHRI from DPS or from another criminal justice agency. Gov't Code §§ 411.083(b)(1), .087(a)(2), .089(a). However, CHRI so obtained is confidential and may only be disclosed in very limited instances. Gov't Code § 411.084; *see also* Gov't Code § 411.087 (restrictions on disclosure of CHRI obtained from DPS also apply

to CHRI obtained from other criminal justice agencies). Therefore, to the extent that the submitted documents contain CHRI that was obtained pursuant to these state and federal regulations, such information must be withheld under section 552.101 as information made confidential by law.

You also assert that the social security numbers contained in the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. A social security number may be confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), if a governmental body obtained or maintains the social security number pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 2-4 (1994). You state that the city obtained the social security numbers pursuant to a city budget ordinance enacted after October 1, 1990. We understand you to assert that this ordinance constitutes a provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, under the Social Security Act. However, because you have not provided a copy of the city budget ordinance for our review, we cannot determine if the ordinance authorizes the city to obtain or maintain social security numbers. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that these social security numbers were obtained or are maintained pursuant to such a law and are therefore confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of the federal law. We caution the city, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Therefore, prior to releasing these social security numbers, the city should ensure that they were not obtained and are not maintained pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989) (individual's mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), certain personal choices relating to financial transactions between the individual and the governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987)

(illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review of the submitted information, we find that a portion of the information is protected by common-law privacy. We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Finally, we note that the submitted information contains information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130.

In summary, absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold the medical records that we have marked pursuant to the MPA. To the extent that the requested records contain CHRI, the city must withhold that information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to sections 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and 552.130 of the Government Code. The city may be required to withhold the submitted social security numbers under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body


fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 201568

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Margie Gordon
109 Chama
Victoria, Texas 77904
(w/o enclosures)